23 JANUARY 1948

INDEX

Of

WITNESSES

Defense' Witnesses	Page
NAKAHARA, Jiro	38131
Direct by Captain Robinson	38131
NOON RECESS	38134
Direct (cont'd) by Captain Robinson	38136
Cross by Mr. Brannon	38145
(Witness excused)	38150

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

No.	Def. No.	Pros. No.	Description Ident	In Evidence
3300		3569	Excerpt from the Osaka Mainichi - 16 September 1941 issue - "Make Mani- fest the Reality of National Total Warfare" by Admiral SHIMADA	1 38085
3340		3838	Comparative Table of Naval Vessels (on hand) Between the United States of America and Japan as of 7 December 1941	38098
3341		3838-A	Comparative Table of Naval Vessels (on hand in Fleets in the Pacific Area) Between the United States of America and Japan as of 7 December 1941	38098
3342		3838-в	Comparative Table of Naval Vessels Under Construction Between the United States of America and Japan as of 7 December 1941	38098
			MORNING RECESS	38107
3336		3838-C	Statement of YOSHIDA, Hidemi	38108
3339		3838-D	Production Analyst in Charge of the Ships Statistics Section of the Bureau of Ships of the U.	38108
	No. 3300 3340 3341 3342	No. No. 3300 3340 3342	No. No. No. 3569 3340 3838 3838-A 3336 3838-C	No. No. No. Description Ident 3300 3569 Excerpt from the Osaka Mainichi - 16 September 1941 issue - "Make Manifest the Reality of National Total Warfare" by Admiral SHIMADA 3340 3838 Comparative Table of Naval Vessels (on hend) Between the United States of America and Japan as of 7 December 1941 3341 3838-A Comparative Table of Naval Vessels (on hend in Fleets in the Pacific Area) Between the United States of America and Japan as of 7 December 1941 3342 3838-B Comparative Table of Naval Vessels Under Construction Between the United States of America and Japan as of 7 December 1941 MORNING RECESS 3336 3838-C Statement of YOSHIDA, Hidemi 3339 3838-D Affidavit of Albert B. Ray, Production Analyst in Charge of the Ships Statistics Section of the Bureau of Ships of the U. S. Navy Department, Washing.

INDEX

of

EXHIBITS

(cont'd)

Doc. Def. No. No.	Pros. No.	Description Iden	In t.Evidence
3351	3838-E	Affidavit of Herbert M. Hart, Commander, U.S. Naval Reserve	38108
3344	3839	Operational History of Japanese Aircraft Carriers	38110
3345	3840	Affidavit of Edwin T. Layton, Captain, U. S. Navy	38115
3146A	3841	Top Secret Communication No. 18 from 8th Sub- marine Squadron Commander to the Ministry of the Navy dated 30 July 1944 (Excerpt from file entitled "Head- quarters No. 5 Naval Air Materials Omitted, Outline of Meritorious Records in the Greater East Asia War, 1 December 1943 to 31 May 1944")	38126
3347	3842	Affidevit of NAKAHARA, Jiro	38134
1552 (Item 30)	3843	Telegram dated 10 April 1942 from POW Information Bureau to the Chief of Staff, 13th Army	38153
1552 (Item 40)	3843-A	Reply to the above tele- gram, dated 13 April 1942	38155

INDEX

0**f**

EXHIBITS

(cont'd)

	Doc.	Def. No.	Pros.	<u>Description</u>	For In dent Evidence
4	1552		3843-B	Telegram dated 16 April 1942 from the POW Information Bureau to the Chief of Staff, 13th Army	38156
	3176		3844	Affidavit of Cecil Raymond Farley	38165
				AFTERNOON RECESS	38166
	3337		3845	Draft submitted for Approv of Higher Office "Matter Relating to the Establis ment of an Office Concer ing Japanese Residing in Enemy Countries and Enem Nationals Residing in Japan"	sh- en-
	3356		3846	Excerpt from Interrogation of HASHIMOTO, Kingoro	38180
	3360		3847	Telegram dated 8 August 1940 sent from Wiesbader by Hencke to the German Foreign Ministry	38183
	3364		3848	Telegram dated 23 February 1941 from Rintelen to the German Representative at Paris	ne .
	3363		3849	Telegram dated 1 March 194 sent by Schleier to the German Foreign Minister	38190

Friday, 23 January 1948

INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL FOR THE FAR EAST Court House of the Tribunal War Ministry Building Tokyo, Japan

The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment, at 0930.
Appearances:

For the Tribunal, all Members sitting, with the exception of: HONORABLE JUSTICE JU-AO MEI, Member from the Republic of China and HONORABLE JUSTICE E. STUART McDOUGALL, Member from the Dominion of Canada, not sitting from 0930 to 1600; HONORABLE JUSTICE R. B. PAL, Member from India, not sitting from 1500 to 1600.

For the Prosecution Section, same as before. For the Defense Section, same as before.

(English to Japanese and Japanese to English interpretation was made by the Language Section, IMTFE.)

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session.

THE PRESIDENT: All the accused are present except SHIRATORI who is represented by counsel. The prison surgeon at Sugamo certifies that he is ill and unable to attend the trial today. The certificate will be recorded and filed.

Captain Kraft.

LANGUAGE ARBITER (Captain Kraft): If the Tribunal please, the following language correction is submitted: reference, record page 30,653, line 2, delete "possible" and substitute "impossible."

THE PRESIDERT: Captain Robinson.

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: Mr. President and Members of the Tribunal, prosecution rebuttal evidence, order list No. 10, is now presented.

IPS document 3300, exhibit 3569 for identification, is offered.

THE PRESIDENT: What is it about?

(Mr. Brannon approached the lectern.) Wr. Brannon, your objection comes rather early. What is this about?

IR. BRANNON: Didn't he offer it in evidence? THE PRESIDENT: Just. He did not tell us the

purpose.

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: This document, in direct quotations, presents the words of the defendant SHIMADA in an official statement. It was made by SHIMADA at the Navy Minister's official residence on 15 September 1941 upon SHIMADA's return to Tokyo from China and followed his audience with the Emperor, which has been described in exhibit 3560.

On cross-examination SHIMADA was confronted with the document, transcript 34,742 to -44. He answered all questions in the negative or by denying recollection. The document rebuts SHIMADA's denials and his testimony that he favored peace and diplomacy, rather than aggressive war.

The importance of the document is in showing SHIMADA as a driving force behind the Japanese campaign to end the China Affair by blockading the China Coast and by bombing Chungking. It shows SHIMADA threatening the "Chiang supporting powers," referring obviously to the United States and Great Britain. He praises total war and calls the China aggression "Holy war." He states the determination to "annihilate the remnants of the foe" thereby contradicting his present testimony that he favored peaceful solution of the China agression.

He calls this press interview his "Report to

all the People," and it is offered particularly as an example of his press propaganda used for preparing and inciting the masses of the Japanese people for what he calls total and "Holy war."

the fact that a month later he was selected as Navy
Minister. And the probative value, if the Court please,
of the document appears to the prosecution to lie in the
fact that these words are the words of the defendant
himself revealing his mind by words of his own mouth,
and for these reasons the prosecution offers in evidence
IPS document 3300, exhibit 3569 for identification.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brannon.

MR. BRANNON: Mr. President, we first ask the direction of the Court that the prosecutor not be allowed to issue a summary at the time of introducing a document.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, it appears to be a very careful preparation, but it was rather long.

However, go ahead with your objection.

MR. BRANNON: This is a newspaper article purporting to contain remarks of the accused SHIMADA at a press conference immediately after his return from China. It, being simply a newspaper report, probably the lowest type of evidence, is highly immaterial along with its

unreliability. It contains nothing but alleged statements of SHIMADA concerning his performance as Commander in Chief of the China Seas Fleet.

In this respect, we wish to call to the attention of the Tribunal SHIMADA's own testimony where he stated that he carried out his naval duties to the best of his ability. Now, there is no denial that the Navy participated in the China Affair, that there was a blockade of the coast, et cetera, and this matter becomes highly redundant and certainly immaterial, especially in the sense of rebuttal.

For example, the second paragraph contains simply a statement of SHIMADA's regret at the loss of lives and his condolence to the families of the injured and the men who died on the battlefield. His statement about the Chungking regime as being on its last legs is merely a military man's opinion, together with such statements that the morale of the men of the Navy was high and that he hopes that the people will give their support, et cetera, makes it all entirely immaterial and irrelevant.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is overruled and the document admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 3300, now exhibit No. 3569 for identification only, will be

marked as received in evidence and retain the same exhibit number.

(Whereupon, exhibit No. 3569, previously marked for identification, was received in evidence.)

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: I shall read from the docu-

"Make Manifest the Reality of National Total Warfare! Says Admiral SHIMADA upon Return

"Admiral Shigetaro SHIMADA, who had been transferred from the post of Commander-in-Chief of the China Area Fleet to that of Commander-in-Chief of the Yokosuka Naval Station, returned to Tokyo on the 15th together with Vice-Admiral Ibo TAKAHASHI who held an important post at the front, and after reporting on the war situation to His Majesty, they withdrew from the Imperial Palace at 2:50 p.m. They then visited the Navy Ministry, and after having tendered their greetings to Navy Minister OIKAWA and Naval Chief of Staff NAGANO, a press interview was held at the Navy Minister's official residence, when Admiral SHIMADA remarked as follows:

when I reported on the war situation, I was deeply stirred by the gracious words of His Majesty. One year and four months have elapsed since I received the Imperial

commands on May 1, 1940, to serve as the Commander-in-Chief of the China Area Fleet. During this time I have managed to deal a serious blow to the anti-Japanese Chungking regime by still further intensifying the blockade and air operations against it."

I want to drop a sentence, if the Court please, to:

"Furthermore, all officers and men under my command are, by braving stormy seas and combatting against intense cold and scorching heat as well as enduring all hardships and privations, doing their utmost towards the attainment of the object of the Holy War by diligently performing their military duties day and night with an ardent sense of loyalty and duty to the State."

I omit the rest of that page, turning to the next page of the document.

last legs as a result of the close combined attack of our Navy and Army, and, on one hand, due to the steady development and strengthening of the Nationalist /TN Nanking/ Government, the settlement of the China Incident has been making steady progress. On the other hand, however, the confrontation between the China supporting powers and our nation has come to assume serious proportions suggestive of an aggravated tension in the inter-

I omit reading the rest because I believe it doesn't bear on the points for which the document was introduced.

The prosecution now offers IPS document No. 3291-A.

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, Captain Robinson.

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: This document is an official report to the Diet by Navy Minister SHIMADA on 16

November 1941.

On cross-examination the defendant was confronted with the document, transcript 34744-47, but deni_d recollection of essential points.

The document contradicts SHIMADA's testimony that he had not aggravated the China Incident and that he was ready to help settle it peacefully. The document shows that as Navy Minister, SHIMADA carried on aggressive testics against China, including blockade, bombardment of cities, and particularly 26 surprise attacks on the China coast by the Japanese Navy. SHIMADA shows special familiarity with surprise attacks by Naval air forces, speaking here about three weeks before the Pearl Harbor attack. In this address he joins TOJO in declaring that a serious international crisis is imminent.

This document has probative value as the official words of the defendant SHIMADA himself.

The prosecution offers in evidence IPS document No. 3291-A.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brannon.

MR. BRANNON: If the Tribunal please, this is not an official report. This appears to be a newspaper gist of an alleged speech made by SHIMADA at a session of the House of Peers and the House of Representatives. None of it purports to be a quotation of what SHIMADA actually said, except a short paragraph on page 3. This quoted paragraph contains merely SHIMADA's words about the international situation given publicly and verifies what he heretofore testified.

The rest of the document appears to be merely a report on the navel operations in China, stating that the objectives were military. There is no denial of the blockade of the China coast by the Navy. "Surprise altack" here could not be used in the sense as stated by the prosecution because this affair had been going on for a length of time and military operations were expected by both sides.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is sustained and the document rejected.

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: The prosecution offers IPS document 3327, exhibit 3570 for identification. THE PRESIDENT: Please state for what purpose.

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: The document is, according

25

24

1

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

or essential points in Navy Minister SHIMADA's talk celebrating the fifth anniversary of the China Incident. The witness was confronted with the document, transcript 34,750-52, but he denied on cross-examination that the document showed him favoring the conquest of China, the domination of Greater East Asia by Japan and the Axis alliance. That question was directly put to him. It contradicts the testimony by SHIMADA, transcript 34,697, that when he entered the TOJO Cabinet he sincerely tried to reach a peaceful solution with the United States and Britain, and the document shows his intense animosity toward America, Britain and China, and strong attachment to "our friends, the Germans and Italians."

Special probative value, theopresacution believes, arises from the fact that the document presents the words of SHIMADA himself, thus revealing his actual mind and intent on each of the three important points which I have mentioned.

If the Court please, I would like to quote from the question put to SHIMADA on this particular point, but I shall not do so unless --

At transcript 34,752, if the Court please, the question was put in cross-examination whether he

did not find in this document, which was placed in his hands, a statement and I quote, "... of the Three Demands which you favored and which made impossible the success of diplomatic negotiations with the United States, namely" --

(Mr. Brannon approached the lectern.)

I would like to finish my sentence, if the
Court please.

MR. BRANNON: If the Tribunal please --THE PRESIDENT: Complete the sentence.

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: (Continued) "--namely,
first, the conquest of China, second, the domination
of Greater East Asia as the special calling of Japan,
and third, the Axis alliance." To which the defendant
SHIMADA answered "There could not have been any
occasion for me to say any such thing because such
an idea has never entered my mind."

This document squarely and briefly contradicts him on each of those three points by brief excerpts that can be made from it.

THE PRESIDENT: Do you object, Mr. Brannon?

MR. BRANNON: I think such comment might be proper after I made an objection to the document.

THE PRESIDENT: Is that directed at me?

AR. BRANNON: No, but --

週

THE PRESIDENT: I went to know whether you object. MR. BRANNON: I am objecting. THE PRESIDENT: The objection is sustained by a majority and the document rejected. CAPTAIN ROBINSON: Sustained, your Honor? MR. BRANNON: To that document? THE PRESIDENT: The document is rejected.

To the same

Win.

쉞

K n a & K e

1

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: IPS documents 3340, 3341, and 3342 are offered. These documents rebut or contradict defense exhibits 3003-A and 3003-B which were introduced by the defense as comparative tables of Japanese and United States Naval vessels "On Fand" and "Under Construction" on 7 December 1941. Defense counsel introduced these exhibits in evidence at transcript page 26,618 and read them into the transcript at pages 26,646 to 650.

Defense counsel introduced exhibit 3001, the certificate of Fr. Albert B. Ray, of the United States Navy Department, as the source of the United States figures used in the comparative tables, transcript pages 26,611-12. Prosecution counsel objected to the admission of the exhibits as not accurate and crossexamined the Japanese Naval Statistician, Captain YOSHIDA, in order to show that the exhibits were not in fact accurate presentations of Mr. Ray's statistics. It was objected that the Japanese and the United States Navy used the terms "On Hand," "Under Construction." and "Miscellaneous" with different meanings. For these reasons it was objected that the charts were not dependable in purporting to show the comparative strength of the Japanese Navy and the United States Navy on 7 December 1941.

The President of the Tribunal in open court made specific suggestions, transcript page 26,628 and transcript page 26,648, that the prosecution might offer in rebuttal evidence which would clear up differences in terminology between the Japanese and American naval statistics. The President said, "That figure, for miscellaneous vessels, ought to be cleared up... The Americans may include under 'miscellaneous' a lot of ships which the Japanese would exclude under the same heading. But we must leave it to the parties to clear that up."

IPS documents 3340, 3341, and 3342 are offered with a view to meeting the suggestion of the President. The certificate on these documents by Mr. Albert B. Ray shows that he has prepared them to conform with the definitions and headings used by Mr. YOSHIDA in preparing exhibits 3003-A and 3003-B.

In these tables Mr. Pay shows that exhibits 3003-A and 3003-B in fact do not present accurately the statistics obtained from Mr. Ray. For example, Mr. Ray's table, IPS document 3340, shows exhibit 3003-A in error on total U.S. vessels "on hand" by an excess of 1,000 vessels and 1,000,000 tons. Mr. Ray's IPS document No. 3342 shows exhibit 3003-B in error on total U. S. vessels "under construction" by an excess of

2

3

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

800 vessels and over 1,200,000 tons.

On cross-examination, as a foundation for rebuttal, the witness YOSHIDA was asked impeaching questions at transcript pages 26,624 and 26,643, to point out that there had been mis-applications of the American Navy figures.

IPS documents 3340, 3341, and 3342, as duly certified by Mr. Albert B. Ray on the face of the tables, are offered in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brannon.

MR. BRANNON: We object to these three documents on the following grounds: They contain the same basic figures and there is no denial of this fact by the prosecution. as those figures which were used to draft the defense documents 3003-A and 3003-P. The prosecution has not shown how these definitions can change the totals by evidence, and until they do so the offer of these documents is premature.

This is true in the face of the fact that the same basic statistics for both charts are admittedly true by both the prosecution and the defense. There did the United States definitions come from, such as the terms "On Hand," "Under Construction," and "l'iscellaneous"? "e don't know.

THE PRESIDENT: I am referred to the last part

24 25

1

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

of Mr. Ray's certificate, where he says he gets them from the Japanese.

MR. BRANNON: I am referring to the American There is no evidence before this Tribunel as to how the United States defined those terms.

Now, if the Tribunal please, actually going to the base of this, here is the answer: The defense has presented a chart showing the comparative strength of the Japanese and the United States Navy. The basis of the statistics was taken from the prosecution figures and the United States figures, which are not questioned. If there is an argument over the meaning of the words "On Hand," it resolves itself simply to this: that as a matter of time, perhaps, the ship did not have its crew assigned to it or some similar small objection. Take, for example, the reduction of battleships; the chart I presented being seventeen to this chart of fifteen. Those ships did not disappear. They were there. It is just a question whether they had the oil aboard 20 or some other technical reason.

I submit this would be true as to vessels under 22 construction. The only difference in the two terms 23 is that the United States says, when they let the contract the ship was under construction, and the Japanese say when the keel was laid it was under construction.

21

10

12

This does not change, Mr. President, the statement made by you on page 26,630 of the record pertaining to this matter. We should not forget the magnitude of the issues here and confuse them with small issues such as might arise in a naval inquiry in Washington or somewhere else. The question to be put to the prosecution in regard to this is whether or not they challenge the United States figures as presented by the defense in exhibit 3001.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection, is overruled and the document admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 3340 will receive exhibit 3838. Prosecution document 3341 will receive exhibit 3838-A. Prosecution document 3342 will receive exhibit 3838-B.

(Whereupon, document 3340 was marked prosecution exhibit 3838 and received in evidence; prosecution document 3341 was marked prosecution exhibit 3838-A and received in evidence; and prosecution document 3342 was marked prosecution exhibit 3838-B and received in evidence.)

THE PRESIDENT: Must you read this?

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: No, sir. I was just going to say, sir, that these documents will not be read extensively into the transcript. In view of the fact, however, that defense counsel read into the transcript, 26,646 to 650, exhibits 3003-A and 3003-B which these new exhibits are offered to rebut, it appears to be necessary to show some of the changes or corrections presented by the new exhibits.

THE PRESIDENT: You have already referred to them. That will be sufficient, perhaps.

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: I have referred to the total, sir, the total difference of some 1800 ships and some 2200 thousand tons, but I haven't referred to any particular figures.

The Court will recall Admiral Richardson's testimony at transcript 11,177-87, on the importance of aircraft carrier supremacy as attained by Japan'. The Court's attention is invited particularly to the fact that exhibit 3838 shows that on 7 December 1941 the United States had six aircraft carriers, whereas Japan had ten.

Reference to exhibit 3838-B, showing the comparative strength in the Pacific, shows the difference to be even greater, with Japan having ten carriers, the

2 3 4

1

.7

6

9

10

12

13 14

15

17 18

19

20

21

23

United States three. That is exhibit 3838-B, the second entry.

I would call attention by way of deviation here
to the fact that table A and table B, and also table C,
with respect to battleships, should be reduced by eight
battleships, in view of the testimony of Admiral
Richardson, transcript 11,235, not disputed in this case,
that the attack on that date, in the morning, either
destroyed or severely damaged eight of the United
States battleships indicated on these charts.

Exhibit 3838 contradicts 3003-A in the following classifications:

Battleships, 15 instead of 17.

Destroyers, 142 instead of 172, and

Miscellaneous types, 176 instead of 1192.

Exhibit 3838-B-contradicts exhibit 3003-B in

Exhibit 3838-B-contradicts exhibit 3003-B in the following classifications:

Under construction: Aircraft carriers, 10 instead of 22.

Light cruisers, 18 instead of 31.

Destroyers, 88 instead of 256.

Submarines, 38 instead of 96, and

Miscellaneous, 349 instead of 895.

IPS document 3341, now exhibit 3838-B, as prepared by Mr. Ray, gives comparative strength in Pacific

3

2

3

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

C

2

4

6

5

8 9

11

12

10

13 14 15

17 18

19

20

16

21 22

24

25

23

Ocean areas. This table, therefore, further provides correction or position for exhibits 3003-A and 3003-B as purporting to present comparative naval strength of Japan and the United States on 7 December 1941.

That is all the comment that I care to make, sir, about the comparisons in correcting the record.

THE PRESIDENT: Are you sure you have called the right number of these exhibits?

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: I beg pardon, sir?

THE PRESIDENT: I am told you are quoting exhibit A when you really mean exhibit B.

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: On table C, I should have 3838-B instead of 3833-B; I see that. In order to have the record straight, may I give the IPS document number and the exhibit number opposite?

IPS document 3340 is exhibit 3838; 3341 is. 3838-A, I see, and IPS document 3842 is 3838-B; is that correct?

On the order of proof, if the Court please, there are three documents listed which may be offered in evidence, although they are merely supplementary to these three charts and are not a necessary part of them.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brannon.

MR. BRANNON: The defense submits that IPS document 3336 is highly relevant, and if the prosecution

.

does not call the witness on that one -- I believe that is the next in line that he is referring to -- the defense will have to in sur-rebuttal.

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: The prosecution will effer in evidence IPS documents 3336, 3339 and 3351, therefore.

THE PRESIDENT: Is there no objection to any of these three?

Wolf & Yoldos

MR. BRANNON: We object to IPS document
3336 which is labeled a certificate but which is,
nevertheless, an affidavit. He is the prosecutor's
witness for they have relied upon his definition of
the terms "on hand," "under construction," and
"miscellaneous." He should be produced for crossexamination by the defense because we clearly intend
to show by this witness that there is no real difference between the American definition of these basic
terms and the Japanese. This strikes directly at the
heart of the chart offered by the prosecution because,
as I said before, the basic statistics are the same and
are not in dispute. It is only definitions.

IPS document 3339, next in order, cannot, of course, be subject to any responsible objection because the other documents have already been admitted by the Tribunal. Suffice to say, the defense has had no chance for cross-examination of Mr. Ray, who drew the American charts although we brought in the Japanese expert who drew the defense chart.

Next in order is IPS document 3351 to which we object. This appears to be some naval officer, reserve naval officer in the United States, to whom copies of the transcript of this trial were sent and who has made observations and opinions as to the

evidence given here before the Tribunal. He is not here for cross-examination and I submit the defense, having been bitterly challenged on a matter of this kind where two charts appear so obviously different, should have the right to examine the American commentator on such a thing. This is the document that sets out the American definitions of these three terms, "on hand," "under construction," and "miscellaneous."

THE PRESIDENT: These are more important than the charts really, because the charts merely carry out what the documents say.

MR. BRANNON: I don't make an idle request,
Mr. President, because the time is short and I realize
how impossible it would be to produce this witness or
to submit interrogations; but when he makes statements
like this in the American definition: "On hand -This included some vessels which had not been fitted
out or reported for Fleet duty." The words, "some
vessels" -- What does it mean? We have no way of
telling here and it could be the same as the Japanese
definition that such ships were generally ready for
operational service.

captain Robinson: If the Court please, I am not sure what counsel is objecting to. The position of the presecution, I thought, was made clear that the

. 11

certificate of Mr. Ray on the charts is considered 1 adequate for their authentication and the documents 2 now offered are offered merely with the idea that they 3 are cumulative. If they would be of assistance to 4 the Tribunal they, of course, are offered; if not, they are not considered necessary.

MR. BRANNON: If the Tribunal please, this document is the foundation document of the presecution charts. The charts cannot exist without the American definition of these three terms and the comparison with the Japanese. We object for the reasons stated.

THE PRESIDENT: I understand you are not objecting to document 3336 because it is your own witness' certificate, but you are objecting to the two American affidavits unless the deponents are called for cross-16 examination.

MR. BRANNON: I can't accept the statement that YOSHIDA is a defense witness in this sense. The prosecution originally introduced the terms "on hand" and "under construction," and they did so by this man YOSHIDA. He was their witness.

I obtained the American figures and had this man YOSHIDA put them together. I never relied upon him except as a draftsman, and I don't accept the statements he makes here.

21

22

6

10

11

12

17

THE PRESIDENT: But exhibits 3003-A and -B are his and yours. They are your evidence.

MR. BRANNON: His definitions are not mine, Mr. President, and I insist that he be called so we will have the right for cross-examination.

THE PRESIDENT: The contest is between him and the two Americans. He is on your side so what is the use of saying he is not your witness or it is not your evidence?

MR. BRANNON: Well, it is not a point necessary to argue. I will just recall him later if the 12 Tribunal is going to allow surrebuttal. We will never 13 clarify this, I assure the Tribunal, until we know the meaning of these two sets of definitions. They have not been explained to this Court.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objections are overruled and the documents admitted on the usual terms.

19 MR. BRANNON: Is the document numbered 3336, 20 so-called certificate of YOSHIDA, to be taken as a certificate or an affidavit? We are requesting the 23 right of cross-examination of this man.

THE PRESIDENT: It looks like an affidavit 25 to me, Mr. Brannon. Not the kind we use, but it looks like a Japanese affidavit, so your right to cross-examine

10

16

17

will not turn on the form of the document.

MR. BRANNON: I request the right to have the witness called for cross-examination before the document is read or afterwards at any time.

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: The reading of these affidavits is not considered to be necessary, if the Court please, by the prosecution.

THE PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen minutes.

(Whereupon, at 1045, a recess was taken until 1100, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:)

whalen & Morse

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed. THE PRESIDENT: Captain Robinson.

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: Are there some exhibit numbers to announce, if the Court please?

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 3336 will receive exhibit No. 3838-C. Prosecution document 3339 will receive exhibit No. 3838-D. And prosecution document 3351 will receive exhibit No. 3838-E.

(Thereupon, the documents above referred to were marked prosecution exhibits No. 3838-C, 3838-D and 3838-E, respectively, and received in evidence.)

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: IPS document 3344 is offered.

It is entitled "Operational History of Japanese Aircraft Carriers."

THE PRESIDENT: Why have you presed over 3340,3341 and 3342? Oh, you tendered those before the recess.

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: Yes, your Honor.

MR. BRANNON: Has the Tribunal ruled upon the defense's request to cross-examine YOSHIDA?

THE PRESIDENT: I have not had an opportunity

of consulting all the Judges yet.

Captain Robinson.

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: IPS document 3344 covers the ten carriers which Japan had on hand on 7 December 1941 in their operations on that date and subsequent to it.

This document is offered to rebut or contradict the testimony of defense witnesses and opening statements of defense counsel.

On direct examination, transcript 26,672, defense witness Admiral Nobutake KONDO testified that Admiral Richardson was in error in stating that Japanese construction of aircraft carriers indicated aggressive intentions because KONDO testified, transcript 26,676, that the Japanese carriers were constructed for defensive purposes and not for offensive; that only six of the carriers "could be utilized for fleet action" and he described the cruising radii of the first line carriers as "far shorter than those of the United States naval ships."

Defense witness Admiral MIYO likewise stated that two of the carriers were "small ships of low speed and short radius of action."

IPS document 3344 is offered not to be quoted or read from but to show that in regard to the offensive qualities of these ten carriers, all ten of them

engaged in combat action and all ten were operating units of Japanese fleets; and with regard to limitations of their radii of operations to Japanese home waters, these carriers, as this exhibit shows, ranged the whole Pacific for a total distance of 330,000 nautical miles, extending from the Aleutians to Singapore, and from Hawaii to the Indian Ocean.

The document is offered in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brannon.

MR. BRANNON: I object to the document on the ground that it is entirely incompetent and immaterial. It doesn't state whether or not the ships were feuled by oil tanker, or what they were. There has been no denial that these were ships used in combat action, with the exception of the first listed here, the Hosho.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is overruled and the document admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 3344 will receive exhibit No. 3839.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution exhibit No. 3839 and received in evidence.)

CAPTAIN KOBINSON: I shall not quote from that exhibit. It is offered merely for reference.

IPS document 3345 is offered. This document

,

is the affidavit of Captain Edwin T. Layton, U. S. Navy, Flort Intelligence Officer, U. S. Pacific Fleet, from 1940 to 1944.

The document is offered to contradict new points raised by the defense in opposition to the Mandate Island evidence presented by Brigadier Quilliam as associate Prosecutor, and by Admiral Richardson as witness, to show unlawful fortification of the Mandate Islands by Japan as preparatory to aggressive war. The defendant SHIMADA testified, transcript 36,667:

"The prosecution statement that fortification of the Mandated Islands was carried out in secret over a period of years prior to 1941 is completely unfounded. While I knew nothing of the blueprint map introduced in evidence, I can only say that it is natural that desk plans be held in reserve for this most vital geographical area in order to meet all eventualities. The United States forces must have recognized even after the occupation of the various South Sea Islands that there was little resembling fortifications. The defenses of these islands were hurriedly carried out from the time immediately prior to the commencement of war with only necessary equipment such as medium calibre guns being installed and the converting of airfields with the main objective in mind of preventing

the enemy from capturing and using these strategically important islands against us."

IPS document 3345 squarely contradicts the defendant SHIMADA on each point stated by him in the paragraph quoted. It also contradicts defense witness YOSHIDA on points which may be left to be indicated later. The document is now offered in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brannon.

MR. BRANNON: If the Tribunal please, this is an attempt at new procedure. Prosecution sends the transcript pages of defense evidence to neval experts in the United States for comment and opinion. They reduce this remote control evidence to writing and submit it as a document. There is no opportunity of cross-examination in any sense here.

Letuelly this is what has happened: the defense enswered the prosccution case relative to the fortification of the mandated islands. We did not bring in any new evidence. Prosecution, under the guise of rebuttel, is enswering the defense's enswer to their own evidence. Certainly enough this practice would naturally give rise to the defense's right to enswer the prosecution's enswer to the defense's enswer and so on ad infinitum. We brought our witnesses into court one after another in the flesh during this phase of the case. We ask that the prosecution do the same .

The effidavit is full of statements and assertions and opinions such as found on nage 6, and I quote this sentence: "It is my firm belief that no notion would start a war believing they were short of ordinance materials; and the Japanese did commence a war on

25

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

7 December 1941."

THE PRESIDENT: There is no need for Captain Layton to say anything so obvious.

MR. BRANNON: Is that a statement of the Tribunal judging this issue?

THE PRESIDENT: Will you read it again? I may have misunderstood it.

MR. BRANNON: "It is my firm belief that no nation would start a war believing they were short of ordinance materials; and the Japanese did commence a war on 7 December 1941."

THE PRESIDENT: I have nothing to add.

MR. BRANNON: We take exception to the remark of the President. May the record so recite.

Now moving on to the annexed exhibits or documents attached to this exhibit, if the Tribunal please, they are American intelligence reports concerning the mandated islands compiled before the war and in the very early stages of the war. They are speculative, incomplete, and subject to inaccuracies as is frankly admitted on page -- document 2, paragraph 7, that is, and I quote: "While this is admittedly incomplete and may be subject to inaccuracies, it represents the latest and best intelligence on this subject." On several instances the defense have attempted to introduce

j

Japanese intelligence reports and they have been consistently rejected by the Tribunal.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is overruled and the document admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 3345 will receive exhibit No. 3840.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution exhibit No. 3840 and received in evidence.)

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: The prosecution wishes to read from page 3 of exhibit 3840. I shall begin with the third paragraph from the top of the page:

"On pages 26,485 & 26,486 of the transcript Captain YOSHIDA distinguishes between a 'konkyochi' and 'kichi'. He admitted these air bases were there (pages 26,472 and 26,473). To my knowledge, almost every Japanese base throughout the war, except the very major ones, were called 'kichi'.

"Moreover, page 323 of the Japanese-English
Dictionary of Sea Terms by Lt. Comdr. C. OZAKI, published
by the 'Suikosha' (Japanese Navel Officers' Club) of
Tokyo shows the Japanese word 'Kichi' defined as 'base',
and gives 10 examples of detailed use of the word 'Kichi'

with various kinds of bases such as 'submarine base', 'navel base', 'repairing base', 'base commander', 'base of operations', etc."

Dropping down to the middle of the next paragraph on the same page, the third sentence in the last paragraph on page 3:

"Though he does not so state directly, Captain
YOSHIDA does intimate that the U.S. Navy used an
expression 'Available Spot' to apply in some way to a
kind of base. The U.S. Navy has never used the term
'available spot' for 'base', whether temporary, advanced or permanent base."

Turning to the next page, page 4, next to the bottom paragraph:

"Documents No. 1 and No. 2 show that Wotje,
Roi ('Ruotto!'), and Taroa were fortified well before
the attack on Pearl Harbor. Document No. 3 confirmed
the fact that those three islands were well fortified
with coastal defense guns, anti-aircraft guns, storage
houses and other facilities, that, by the Japanese
definition, constitute a neval base."

Omit to the next page, middle paragraph, page

"Documents No. 1 and No. 2 show that the first Japanese move to bring large amounts of maval personnel,

5/6

5:

1 nevel materiel, naval engineers and ordnance experts to the Marshalls was actually observed in mid-Lecember 1940. YOSHIDA denies their existence (pege 26,474) until a decision made in November 1941 (page 26,477). There is not the slightest shedow of a doubt that our intelligence indicating the movement in 1940 is correct and that YOSHIDA suffers a year's lapse of memory. From information I had at hand at the time, I am positive that 'the organization of construction, procurement of necessary meterials, ellotments of ships, etc., took place' (page 26,477) not on November 5, 1941, as he says, but probably November 5, 1940, as we picked up the indications of such a movement in December 1940."

I shall read no more from that document, but I should like to quote briefly from the ennexes of the document, Annex No. 1 and prige 4:

"(B) Material Installations in the Mandates "For many years Japan has effectively prevented observation of activities in the Mandated Islands. However, it is known that as a result of extensive hydrographic and meteorological surveys, considerable expension and improvements have been completed in harbor development, 'commercial' air facilities, communications and metcorological establishments in the principal

24

25

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

islands (Jaluit, Ponape, Kusaie, Truk, Palao, and Saipan). Since late in 1940 Orange Navel and Air Operations in this area have increased and some forty to forty-five navel auxiliaries (cargo, transport, supply, and tankers ex-merchant marine) now make continuous shuttle trips to the Mandates with personnel, material, equipment and supplies. (Places marked # below have been distination for these vessels.) The 'Material Installations' are listed below to bring up to date the information reported in ONI-49, 'Extracts from the Japanese Monograph 1939', pages 127.01 to 127.24 inclusive."

Omitting snything further in that annex over to page 15, the second main paragraph on page 15 of Annex 1:

tion was apparently reached concurrently with the signing of the Tri-Parte Pact, as movements of navel reserve auxiliaries (taken over from the Merchant Marine) to the Mandates became apparent thereafter. Since late in nineteen forty this movement of personnel, materials, and supplies has progressively increased until in July, 1941, there were approximately forty to forty-five ships constantly engaged in round trips between Orange mainland and the Mandates. An analysis shows about

sixty-five percent of this shipping is destined for the Lastern Carolines and Marshalls."

Dropping to the bottom paragraph: "Discussion of Short Organizations and Activites "During the early months of 1941, evidence has shown that an Administrative Organization has been. set up for control and expansion of the military developments of the Mandates. This Mandate Organization is taking the line parallel to but separate from the parent organization, Yokosuka Administration chain, previously in control. While Palso has always been the Mandate /dminstrative center (and may continue to be) the focus of Supply, Civil Engineering and Munitions

in the Mandates is now centered at Truk."

15

1

2

3

4

5

10

11

12

13

14

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23 24

Duda & Yelden

Omitting the rest of that annex and turning to Annex No. 2, at page 4 at the top: "Intelligence Bulletin No. 45-41.

"(A) ORGANIZATION OF THE JAPANESE FLEETS.
October 30, 1941 (1057)."

Dropping to the second paragraph below:

"The principal change consists of a further increase in the number of fleet commands. This has arisen from the regrouping of aircraft carriers and seaplane tenders into separate forces, and from the creation of special task forces in connection with the southward advance into Indo-China. The regrouping has resulted in a notable specialization within the various commands, as shown below."

Reading the next paragraph: "The Japanese
Navy now includes more vessels in active service than
ever before. More merchant ships have been taken over
by the Navy, and the line between merchant ship and
naval auxiliary grows fainter all the time. The base
forces and guard divisions in the Mandated Islands have
also greatly increased the strength of the Navy, which
is on full wartime footing."

Dropping to the bottom paragraph:

"(B) JAPANESE FORCES AND INSTALLATIONS IN THE MANDATED ISLANDS.

22 23

"1. Fourth Fleet, which may be termed the Mandate Fleet," --

2

4

5

6

17

18

19

20

I simply refer the Court to that. I shall not read the rest of the paragraph.

Dropping over to the next paragraph, page 5, the top paragraph:

"2. Up to the present the entire Mandated Islands have been lightly garrisoned, the majority of the garrison units being Naval Defense Forces ('special Landing Forces' corresponding to our Marine Corps) but some Army troops are believed to be on Saipan, Palae, Ponape, Truk and Jaluit. The total garrison force has been estimated at fifteen thousand. In addition, there are Civil Engineering Units engaged in development work on various islands. Working in conjunction with these are naval engineering units, naval ordnance specialists, navy yard units with civilian navy yard workers and technicians. The network of naval radio stations has been greatly expanded, meteorological stations and high frequency direction finders installed at strategic locations, aviation facilities increased both in scope and number, and shore-batteries emplaced on strategic islands of key atolls."

And the next paragraph:

expedite the fortification, expansion of facilities and militarization of the Mandated Islands, was made late in 1940, probably concurrently with the signing of the Tripartite Pact. The movement of naval auxiliaries, small and medium cargo, freight passenger vessels (ex-merchant marine) to the Mandates began in December, 1940, and has increased in scope and number until some seventy odd vessels are engaged in this traffic, the average number present in the Mandate area at any one time being some forty odd vessels."

Turning to the next page, paragraph 7:

"7. The distribution of material, personnel, and installations in the Mandatad Islands is indicated in table 'A.' While this is admittedly incomplete and may be subject to inaccuracies, it represents the latest and best intelligence on this subject. In addition to those listed in Table A, there are a number of potential bases, principally in the lagoons of the naturally protected atolls, which may be used as emergency bases or may be earmarked for 'priority two' development."

I shall not read any more from that extract.

I refer to Table A attached to this annex.

In Table A I refer only to the chief Mandated Islands

3

5 6

7 8

10

11

1 12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

2:

2.,

mentioned in the testimony of Admiral Richardson on this question of fortification of the Mandates as the eight islands or atolls on which the Combined Fleet, Top.Scret, Operation Order No. 1, indicated bases, namely: Saipan, Kwajalein, Wotje, Jaluit, Taroa, Truk, Penape and Palau. Finally, I wish to quote briefly from Annex No. 3, rage 1, Admiral Halsey's report, beginning at the top of the page: 'United States Pacific Fleet, Aircraft, 10 Battle Force, U.S.S. Enterprise. 11 "Flagship. 12 "Pearl Harbor, T.H. 13 "9 February 1942. 14 "From: Commander Task Force Eight. 15 "To: Commander in Chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet. 16 "Subject: Action in the Marshall Islands, 17 18 1 February 1942." Dropping to: "Enclosure: (A) CO Enterprise 19 report of action on 1 February 1942, with enclosures 20 21 thereto."

22

23 24

of the action of the Enterprise Air Group and squadron in the objective areas. Information contained herein

tences: "The enclosures provide detailed narratives

Dropping to paragraph 2, the first two sen-

on the results of the bombardments of Task Groups 8.1 and 8.3 is based on preliminary dispatch reports only; more detailed information will be forwarded as soon as received."

Dropping toward the bottom of the page:

"(b) Shore installations destroyed or
damaged:

"(1) Wotje: The entire installation was apparently destroyed. This includes two hangars, fuel oil tanks, gasoline stowage, warehouses, shops and barracks. Two A.A. batteries and all coastal delense guns were silenced or abandoned.

"(2) Taroa: Two hangars destroyed, several buildings hit and aftre in industrial area; both fuel tanks were ablaze. The radio station on Ollet Island destroyed.

"(3) Roi: Two hangars destroyed. Ammunition dump blown up and fuel fire left burning. Radio building demolished. All store and warehouses demolished by explosion resulting from bombing. Fire in town on island east of Roi,"

Dropping to the bottom of that page, item 20: "20. Miscellaneous notes on enemy.

"(a) Both Roi and Taroa had complete air bases of recent construction. Wotje also had a new

installation. Pilots report Taroa base better equipped than Ford Island.

"(b) A.A. batteries present on Roi; Kwajalein, Taroa, Wotje, and Ollet. Guns of 3", .50 and .3¢ caliber.

"(c) Kwajalein apparently used as submarine base.

"(Signed) W. F. Halsey."

The next item on the order of proof, IPS document 3146-A, which has been given exhibit No. 3572-A for identification, is offered. This document is a top secret communication from the 8th Submarine Squadron Commander, Admiral ICHIOKA, to the Ministry of the Navy, covering operations of that squadron between December 1, 1943 and May 31, 1944. It bears on the subject of Japanese-German joint submarine operations in the Indian Ocean. The defendant SHIMADA, as already noted, has discounted such collaboration and has denied command responsibility.

On cross-examination SHIMADA testified

(transcript 34,787) that he was acquainted with Rear

Admiral ICHIOKA but had no recollection that he was
a commander of the 8th Submarine Squadron while

SHIMADA was Navy Minister and Chief of the Naval

General Staff. The defendant on cross-examination,

2 3

1

5

7

6

3 9

10

11

13

15

16

18

20

21

22

24

at transcript pages 34,787-88, was asked a series of questions based on this document. The document was handed to the defendant for examination. He replied to all questions in the negative or by denying recollection. The document was then offered and marked for identification and it is now offered in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brannon.

MR. BRANNON: On the face of the document it disqualifies itself for the purpose for which it is offered, that is, to show SHIMADA's knowledge of the contents, for the reason that it was reported on July 30, at which time SHIMADA was not Navy Minister, and actually was received by the Navy Ministry after SHIMADA had retired from active service.

THE PRESIDENT: Do you wish to add anything?

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: If the Court please, it

covers a period, 1 December 1943 to 31 May 1944, during

which period the defendant was for part or all of the

time both Navy Minister and Chief of the Naval General

Staff. It describes transactions, therefore, which

cover the period while he was in command responsibility.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is overruled and the document admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 3146-A will receive exhibit No. 3841.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution exhibit No. 3841 and received in evidence.)

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: I shall read from exhibit 3841, excerpts.

"Top Secret Communication No. 18 from 8th Submarine Squadron Commander to the Ministry of the Navy dated 30 July 1944 (excerpt from file entitled Headquarters No. 5, Naval Air Materials Omitted, Outline of Meritorious Records in the Greater East Asia War, 1 December 1943 - 31 May 1944).

"To Minister of the Navy:

"Reported on the 30th July, by Rear Admiral ICHIOKA, Hisash", the Commander of the 8th Submarine Squadron; at the Headquarters of the 8th Submarine Squadron.

"/The Seal of the Commander of the 8th Submarine Squadron./

"/Personal Secret. Naval Secret. The 8th Submarine Squadron Secret No. 18./"

THE PRESIDENT: Why read all that?

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: Well, sir, I thought the secret classifications there would be of importance.

Dropping to the bottom of the page, lefthand column, under the heading, "Operational Actions": "(1) From the last month on, this squadron

"(1) From the last month on, this squadron continued to stay at the base of Penang as the South-western Area Submarine Squadron. With the submarines

疆

11

8

22

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

24

23

under my command, squadron prevented enemy's reinforcement for counter-attack from Indian Ocean and crushed its tactical attempt to attack vessels; cooperated with and supported the Army in preventing enemy's reinforcement from the sea towards India-Burma border; cooperated successfully in transporting spies and men on special missions who were stealing in to feel out enemy's situation in India, reconnoitered and ravaged enemy's transportation route from Australia and the eastern coast of Africa to the Aden Bay, Arabian Coast, India and the Bay of Bengal; greatly contributed to judgment of enemy's conditions in the western area by carrying out reconnaissance and patrol on all strategic points under joint operation with 'HO' Reconnaissance Planes Group."

Turning to the next page, reading the top paragraph on the left-hand side.

THE PRESIDENT: Well, why? Why not go down to paragraph (4)?

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: Very well, sir.

THE PRESIDENT: Oh, yes, (2) refers to Germany.

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: Yes, sir. Shall I read

it, sir?

THE PRESIDENT: Read (2).

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: (Reading) "Operational

2 3 1

7

10

11

19

12

14

16

18

20

19

22

21

23

Actions. Services related to War and others.

"(2) A part of the submarines under my command (Sub 'I' No. 8, Sub 'I' No. 29, sub 'I' No. 52, and Sub 'Ro' No. 501) were despatched to the Atlantic Ocean and European waters on special duty and engage in joint operation for a long period to keep on liaison between Japan and Germany."

I shall omit paragraph (3). Across on the right-hand column, I should like to include paragraph (5).

"(5) The Sub 'I' No. 8, having accomplished on December 20 the special duty shown in Imperial Head-quarters Navy Section Instruction No. 205, returned from Europe; it left Kure on February 21 and is now operating in this area."

And the final paragraph on the left-hand column, (4):

"(4) For the German submarines which had hastily been dispatched for Japanese-German joint submarine operations in Indian Ocean, sufficient cooperation was given in liaison as well as in such preparation as maintenance and supply; thus German submarines were enabled to show their efficiency in the Japanese-German joint operation advantageously, resulting in a great contribution to the success of the strategic

8 9

plan for the destruction of transportation in the Indian Ocean Area. The material battle results during this period are as follows: "Sunk: Merchant ships 20 (190,000 tons). "Sailing Vessels 8 (1,200 tons). "Damaged: One Merchant ship of large size. "Prisoners: 9 enemy crew, besides an English

Captain."

The last item on the order of proof is a witness, IPS document 3347, please.

Will the witness Jiro NAKAHARA be called, please, Mr. Marshal.

JIRO NAKAHARA, called as a witness on behalf of the prosecution, being first duly sworn, testified as follows:

DIRECT EXAMINATION

BY CAPTAIN ROBINSON:

Please state your name.

Jiro NAKAHARA.

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: May the witness be shown IPS document No. 3347.

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

Please examine that, Mr. Witness, and state

14 15

5

7

9

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

to the Tribunal whether it is an affidavit culy executed by you.

A Yes, it is.

Are the contents thereof true and correct?

A Yes.

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: The prosecution offers in evidence the affidavit, IPS document 3347.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brannon.

MR. BRANNON: This affidavit is objected to on the ground that it is a continuation of the naval presentation of atrocities, and properly should have been introduced at that time. The only purpose, apparently, for its introduction now is to show that atrocities occurred in the vicinity of the Indian Ocean or on the Indian Ocean, and were ordered by the Chief of the Naval General Staff.

On the first point, the witness definitely states he at no time saw any execution or the taking of life. And as to proof that this was ordered by the Chief of Naval General Staff, his statements are the grossest of hearsay.

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: If the Court please, I refer to the cross-examination of the defendant SHIMADA, transcript 34,774. The question asked the defendant was this:

22

20

21

17

24

"Q And, now, during that period (February 1944 to July 1944) when you were both Chief of the Naval General Staff and Navy Minister, did you, in either or both of your capacities, learn of the widespread atrocities about which evidence has been presented in this case as committed by Japanese submarine personnel in the Indian Ocean and by other Japanese personnel on numerous Pacific Islands?

"A No, I learned nothing. I knew nothing.

immediately after you took that double command position in February 1944, Japanese submarines launched their special campaign to cut Allied supply lines in the Indian Ocean and to massacre survivors of torpedoed ships?

"A I never knew that such things ever occurred, and I cannot believe in them -- believe that they ever occurred."

This evidence, this testimony, as shown by this affidavit is offered to show that an employee of the Naval General Staff was provided for the Japanese submarine I-8, and after serving aboard it with the circumstances such as are shown by the affidavit, that he returned to the Naval General Staff, that no inquiries were made of him or of anybody else aboard

6 7

the I-8 or elsewhere in the Japanese Navy with regard to the atrocities in the Indian Ocean.

THE PRESIDENT: The object's is overruled and the document admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 3347 will receive exhibit No. 3842.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution exhibit No. 3842 and received in evidence.)

THE PRESIDENT: We will adjourn until halfpast one.

(Whereupon, at 1200, a recess was

taken.)

15

5

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

.18 19

20

21

22

23

24

Wolf & Lefler

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at 1330.

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International

Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: Captain Kraft.

LANGUAGE ARBITER (Captain Kraft): If the Tribunal please, the following language alteration is submitted: reference, exhibit No. 3788-A, last paragraph, and record page 37,711, lines 18 to 25, and page 37,712, lines 1 to 9:

Delete the entire paragraph and substitute:

"That day I (HARADA) met KIDO. KIDO said:

The whole matter has been handled in a slipshod way.

So, I, too, said plenty at the Cabinet meeting. I

wonder if the General Staff hasn't made various commitments in concrete terms through the German Military

Attache in Tokyo. I feel it very dangerous to see the Army and Navy, especially the Army, or rather the General Staff so anxious to press the peace solution.

If we submit many concrete terms and were turned down, we would be only letting them in on what we want. It would all be a loss and no gain. I am very worried, wondering why they are in such a hurry. Today at the Cabinet meeting, I made a strong statement asserting,

"It is necessary that the terms be more abstract and cover everything. What need is there to obligate ourselves by asking Germany?" It is vary strange that the General Staff is so eager. I am worried that Germany might be putting one over on us."

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, Captain Kraft. Captain Robinson.

JIRO NAKAHARA, called as a witness on behalf of the prosecution, resumed the stand and testified as follows:

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: Mr. President and Members of the Tribunal, exhibit 3842, omitting the formal parts, reads as follows:

"I, Jiro NAKAHARA, being duly sworn upon oath, make the following statement:

"1. My name is Jiro NAKAHARA. I was born in the Territory of Hawaii, of Japanese parents, in 1920. I came to Japan in 1938. My registered domicile is Yamaguchi Ken, Oshima Gun, Shiroki-Mura, Tononyu.

"2. The Japanese Naval General Staff in November, 1942, called me in to work as a civilian radio monitor at the Japanese Naval Foreign Breadcast listening post. In February, 1943, I was ordered to go to Truk Atolls. I returned to Japan in October, 1943, and

5

1

7

6

8

10

12

13 14

> 15 16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23 24

worked on the listening post in the Naval Headquarters at Tokyo until February, 1944. In that month Commander ARIIZUMI of the Japanese submarine I-8 went to the Navy Ministry in Tokyo and asked for a civilian radio monitor for the I-8, and I was assigned to that duty on written order, sealed by the Vice-Chief, Naval General Staff.

"3. I boarded the I-8 at Kure and we left Japan in February, 1944, and headed for Penang. We stayed in Penang for a week and then went into the Indian Ocean on a patrol south of Ceylon, which lasted from March until May, 1944.

named Tjisalak. About a half hour after the torpedoes hit the ship, the submarine surfaced. Commander ARII-ZUMI ordered me to come to the conning tower and to call by megaphone to the lifeboats to come to the submarine. I was told to tell the people in the lifeboats to board the submarine one by one, to go to the foredeck and sit down there, and that they would be shot if they looked back. As they boarded the submarine they were stripped of life belts, watches and all other possessions except their clothes. There were about 100 persons consisting of passengers and crew.

"5. The Captain of the ship, the radio man, the engineer officer, about four other men, and a woman

1

8

10

11

12

13

15

16

passenger were taken below in the submarine.

"6. As the prisoners boarded the submarine, their hands were tied behind their backs. After most of the prisoners had been seated on the deck forward, four members of the submarine crew went up and brought the prisoners back, one by one, and they were killed. As soon as I heard what was going on, I went below to ,the officers' messroom. I was called up again by the Serior Officer to tell them again that they would be shot if they looked back. I did not actually witness the killings, but according to the members of the crew, the survivors of the torpedoed ship were clubbed, slashed with swords and shot to death. This continued for about one hour. The Senior Officer, Lieutenant HONDA, told me to stay on the foredeck and kept telling me to tell the prisoners to face toward the front, otherwise they would be shot if they looked back.

when the submarine submerged. Commander ARIIZUMI ordered me to act as interpreter in questioning the prisoners who had been taken below. The interrogations were held in the officers' messroom. He first questioned the woman. She was then taken to the forward crews' quarters. About an hour later I went to that room. I asked the woman if there was anything that she wanted.

17

19

18

20

22

23 24

The only thing she said was that she wanted a cup of water, so I brought it to her. She told me that she was in Japan for some time before the war started, that she was an American Red Cross worker, and that she was on her way to Bombay, I think. While I was talking to her the Senior Officer and four sailors came in. They had two rifles. The Senior Officer said to me in Japanese that she would have to be shot. I did not tell her but I think she knew what was going to happen. It was then night time. The sailors took the prisoners up on deck one by one and shot them; at least I think so, because some of the crew afterwards told me that they were shot. Just before she was taken, I couldn't look her in the face. She told me that she knew what was going to happen. The Senior Officer told me to ask her if she wanted to be blindfolded and her hands tied. She said she didn't and he said that was okay. Just before she left she said, 'Sayonara,' the 'Sayonara' was addressed to all of the crew. I do not remember whether they completed the interrogations of the men prisoners before the woman was executed or not.

brought below with his hands tied behind his back. He told me to tell Commander ARIIZUMI that it was contrary to International Law to have his hands tied. When I

20

11

13

114

15

17

18

19

22

23

3 4

1

6

7

8 9

10 11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20

21

23

25

24

interpreted that statement to ARIIZUMI, he said, 'Bakayaro (fool), this is war.' The Master of the Tjisalak also asked ARIIZUMI to be kind and lenient with the crew of the Master's ship. After they finished interrogating him, I think they took him to the forward crews' quarters. I saw him there at the time I was talking to the Red Cross worker.

"9. When ARIIZUMI finished interrogating the Master of the Dutch ship, the radio officer of that ship was interrogated by the Communications Officer of the submarine, and I acted as interpreter. Then an Engineering Officer was interrogated by the First Officer of the submarine. I never saw any of the prisoners after I left the forward crews' quarters.

"10. I heard Commander ARIIZUMI telling Lieutenant HONDA and the medical officer and one other officer in the officers' mess of the I-8 on the day after the sinking of the Tjisalak that the Naval General Staff had ordered that all survivors of the sunken ships were to be killed. I think HONDA passed this order to the crew. All of us obeyed orders from ARIIZUMI because we knew he was ruthless. His nickname among the crew was Gyangu, meaning gangster.

"11. Commander ARIIZUMI had told me during the interrogation of the Master of the ship that the Japanese NAKAHARA

Naval Headquarters had issued an order that everyone on board enemy vessels was to be slain. He also told us not to tell anybody about the slaying of the prisoners.

DIRECT

"12. As soon as the first patrol was finished we came back to the base at Penang. When we got back I told Commander AhIIZUMI that I couldn't go on another trip because I was suffering from spinal sclerosis, and I am supposed to wear a cast. He told me if I didn't go I would be courtmartialed. I knew I could not be court-martialed because I was a civilian.

"13. We left Penang on the second patrol after spending about three weeks there making repairs. This second patrol continued from early June until early August 1944. This patrol was in the same area as the first. In July the I-8 sank the SS Nicolet. In this second sinking it was exactly the same story as in the sinking of the Tjisəlak three months earlier. As soon as the submarine fired the torpedoes, it surfaced. Upon orders of Commander ARIIZUMI, I called through the megaphone for the survivors to come aboard the submarine. Again survivors were stripped of all their belongings except their clothing, were bound, and sent forward under guard to sit down on the foredeck. There were about 80 survivors who came aboard the submarine. After the Master of the Nicolet and other prisoners had been taken below, the rest of the survivors according to what I heard from the crew, were brought

21 22 24

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

20

back one by one and killed by shooting, bayonetting, clubbing or by slashing with swords.

"14. The Master of the Nicolet, the radio man, an engineer, a State Department man and maybe some others who had been taken below, were interrogated. The Master of the Nicolet was questioned by Commander ARIIZUMI, the radio man by the Communications Officer, and the engineer by the engineer of the submarine. They were the same people who did the questioning on the first patrol. Again I was the interpreter. I heard that all the prisoners were executed aboard the submarine, except the Master and the State Department man, and the only prisoner whom I later saw leaving the submarine was the State Department man. The State Department men was thin and had a beard. He asked me for a rezor but the Captain told me I could not give him one, and I told a Petty Officer, who, I think, gave him a razor. I told the State Department men that he would get along better if he would cooperate more with the Japanese personnel. He thanked me. This was while we were anchored at Penang but I had not gotten off the ship. I remember we brought him back to Japan in the I-8. I later saw him at Yokosuka.

"15. I did not see any of the executions but

11

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

21

22

24

I was told by other members of the submarine crew
that some of the prisoners that were taken below
were beheaded and that Commander ARIIZUMI did some
of the beheading personally. I saw the Engine Room
Divisional Officer wiping blood off of his sword after
some of the executions and wash his hands in disinfecting water.

"16. Since I was a civilian on the ship and also because I was a Nisei, I was not trusted by many members of the I-8 crew and they did not tell me everything that happened.

"17. I returned to Japan on the I-8 in
September 1944 and resumed my work as a civilian
radio monitor at the Naval General Staff, where I
worked until August 1945. Soon after I reported back
at Naval General Staff I was told by the Chief of the
Third Section not to relate my experience overseas.
I heard later that Captain ARIIZUMI killed himself
at the end of August 1945. I have read in ARIIZUMI's
official naval personal service record that he was
promoted to Captain in October 1944.

"18. I have never been questioned at the Naval General Staff, or elsewhere by Japanese Naval or Foreign Office personnel in regard to the events which I have described in this statement. I never

heard that any of the members of the I-8 crew were questioned in regard to these events by Japanese Naval or Foreign Office personnel. I was first interrogated in regard to these events by Lieutenant W. Salter, Royal Naval Volunteer Reserve, of the Legal Section, General Headquarters, Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers, on 13 June 1947, and then at later dates by Mr. Thomas C. Fisher of the Legal Section, GHQ, SCAP.

"Signed Jiro, NAKAHARA."
You may cross-examine.
THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brannon.

CLOSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. BRANNON:

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

19

20

21

23

Q How many people were killed on both ships, would you say, Mr. NAKAHARA?

A I am not sure about the exact number of prisoners, but I am sure it was about -- about 200.

Q Well, in your affidavit I understand there were a hundred on the first ship and eighty on the second, but I am not pressing that discrepancy.

A Well, as I already told you, I am not sure about the exact number but it was a rough estimate.

Q Of these many unfortunate people I understand your testimony to be that you did not personally see

any of them killed; is that correct?

A Yes, that is true.

Q And you have stated you weren't trusted by the Japanese members of the crew because you were a Nisei.

A Yes.

Q And they didn't tell you everything that went on.

A Well, some of them had told me.

Q But you say they didn't tell you everything that went on.

A Yes.

Q So that it is entirely possible that these people were not all killed as you have stated in your affidavit from the hearsay, is it not?

A Well, as far as I know, I saw two prisoners brought -- I saw one of them brought back to Penang.

Q Did you see everybody that left the ship after it anchored?

A Do you mean by that the officers and crew members of the submarine?

Q Everyone.

A Well, not all of them.

Q Now, Mr. NAKAHARA, you were about 22 years old at this time?

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

18

19

21

22

23

24

25

2:

A	About	24.	I	guess.
17	noout	- 19	-	Pacace

- Q Japanese count?
- A. Yes, sir.
- Q And being a Nisei you were not trusted with secret information or secret assignments, were you?
 - A No.

5

6

7

10

11

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

- Q Now, are you prepared to tell this Tribunal with any certainty that you know of a Naval order that was issued, commanding the killing of survivors of ships?
 - A Yes.
 - Q Yes, what, Mr. NAKAHARA?
- A I can say that Commander ARIIZUMI had orders from the Naval General Staff to execute all survivors aboard sunken enemy vessels.
- Q What I mean is that you never saw any official orders issued by the Naval General Staff or the Navy Ministry commanding the killing of survivors of enemy vessels; is that not correct?
- A I have never seen a written order issued by the Naval General Staff.
- Q As a matter of fact, Commander ARIIZUMI would have received his orders from his Squadron Commander and the not the Naval General Staff, would be not?
 - A That -- well, I am not sure about that.

.

-

23

Q In other words, all you are testifying to is that you heard the Japanese Commander tell some other officers at mealtime, and also tell you what he told you, that there were orders from the Naval General Staff ordering the killing of survivors.

A Yes, that is correct.

Q Why do you think the Commander told you not to tell about these killings if it was in compliance with orders?

A It may have been that it might be troublesome.

Q To whom?

A Well, I don't know.

Q Well, if a Japanese officer obeys orders it is nothing to be afraid of, is it, to admit that he carried out his orders?

A Well, I was a civilian at the time and I don't know about that because I was not an officer.

3

5

7

В

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

in

18

19

21

22

23

24

& K e

Then you went back to Tokyo and to the Naval General Staff, did you report to anybody in the Naval General Staff concerning this matter?

I did not relate my experience or activities overseas to any of the officers.

Do you know whether Commander ARIZUMI reported the killing of these people?

No.

As far as you know, then, no one reported these acts to any one in Tokyo?

As far as I know, no.

Why do you make point of the fact that you were never questioned by the Naval General Staff regarding the events you have described?

"ell, we went to Truk Atoll once, and when I came back from Truk Atoll the Chief of the Third Section told me not to relate my experience overseas.

Q "ell, that may be a routine security matter, but are you trying to tell the Tribunal the instructions were given to you to prevent you from revealing the commission of atrocities?

I don't think so.

Did the people on the Dutch ship speak English?

A Yes, some of them spoke English.

All of them that you interrogated I presume

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

13

21

22

23

spoke English?

A As far as I can recollect, it was the master of the ship and the radioman.

O yow long did your submarine stay surfaced during the time of the Dutch ship incident?

A J can't remember.

Q Can you give us an estimate? "as it an hour, two hours?

A You mean after the sinking of the Dutch ship?

O After taking aboard the prisoners.

A It may have been an hour or two hours; I am not sure.

MR. BRANNON: That is all.

THE PRESIDENT: Captain Robinson.

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: If the Court please, I ask that the witness be excused on the usual terms.

THE PRESIDENT: He is excused accordingly.

(Whereupon, the witness was excused.)

CAPTAIN ROBINSON: This concludes Order List 10 of prosecution rebuttel evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Brannon.

MR. BRANNON: "e had an objection to the document, the affidavit of YOSHIDA, and at the time we asked that he be called for cross-examination the Tribunal said they had not yet decided the matter

12

24

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

among them and would rule later. Might we ask for a ruling now, Mr. President?

THE PRESIDENT: We are not in a position to give a decision yet, Mr. Brannon.

Colonel Mornane.

during the course of the evidence for the defense in the POW phase and during some of the individual phases, a number of Red Cross reports were put in evidence.

These described the conditions of various camps as being good. In addition, during the evidence of some of the defense witnesses, evidence was given of conversations with Red Cross representatives wherein the representative expressed satisfaction at the condition of camps visited.

It is this type of evidence that the prosecution is now seeking to rebut. I invite the Tribunal's
attention to the fact that even had the prosecution
been aware of these Red Cross reports, it could not
in the course of the prosecution's case have set them
up as an Aunt Sally for the purpose of knocking them
down.

KUDO, Tadao, pages 27,146-68, called during the defense POW phase, refers to visits by Red Cross delegates to various camps, including one to Shanghai

prisoner-of-war camp on 18 August 1942. He goes on to say, "The delegates of the International Red Cross Committee, after visiting various camps as mentioned above, reported that the conditions there were "good," "favorable," or excellent."

SAWADA, Shigeru, pages 27,442-71, was also called during the prisoner-of-war phase. He was Commander of the 13th Army at Shanghai until October, 1042. He gave general evidence of the good treatment of prisoners of war, and went on to say, "The prisoner-of-war camp was properly equipped and properly managed. Mr. Egley, a Saiss, delegated by the International Red Cross to inspect the camp, was highly delighted after he had inspected the camp, and immediately after his visit to the camp took the trouble of writing me a letter of thanks."

with the permission of the Tribunal the prosecution proposes to tender official Japanese documents to show that the visit to this camp was delayed from April until August for the purpose of ensuring that the prisoners of war would make no complaints and of preparing the camp for inspection. This would explain and rebut the effect of such reports.

These documents form part of exhibit 3367, which has already been marked for identification,

page 31,790. The first document is IPS document No. 1552, Item 30. It is a telegram dated 10 April 1942 from POW Information Bureau to Chief of Staff 13th Army. I tender that document in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Is there any objection?

Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 1552, Item 30, will receive exhibit No. 3843.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution exhibit 3843 and received in evidence.)

COLONEL MORNANE: It contains two paragraphs, both of which I shall read.

"1. Although permission had been requested some time ago by the Swiss Consul-General in Shanghai and the representatives of the International Red Cross Committee to inspect the Shanghai P.O.W. Camps and report on its condition to the nations concerned after having personal talks with the prisoners of war, in consideration of the fact that the preparation and equipment of the camp had not been completed at that time so soon after the fighting, we have kept it postponed until this day.

"2. It is our presumption that you have completed arrangements by now and so in accordance with international provisions intend to permit the tour of

inspection of our Shanghai P. O. W. Camp in the near future. Please let me know your opinion on the matter as soon as possible."

The second document is IP: document No. 1552,

Item 40, and is a reply to the previous exhibit. It is
dated 13 April 1942. I tender it in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: No objection? Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 1552, Item 40, will receive exhibit No. 3843-A.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution document No. 3843-A and received in evidence.)

COLONEL MORNANE: I will now read the body of that document:

"As to the inspection of the camp by the *wiss
Consul-General in shanghai and the representatives of
the International Red Cross Committee, I am of the
opinion that it should be postponed for a while because
the arrangement of the camps, such as the dispensary,
sick-room, kitchen, bath and other places concerned,
are not yet completed, and also the fact that a part of
the prisoner of war room is being renovated. Besides
these things the present mental attitude of the prisoners
is not reasonable."

My next document is IPS document No. 1552, It is from the Prisoner of War Information Bureau to the Chief of Staff, 13th Army, and is in reply

X

to the previous exhibit. It is dated 16 April 1942. I tender it in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 1552,

Item 35, will receive exhibit No. 3843-B.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution exhibit No. 3843-B and received in evidence.)

COLONEL MORNANE: I propose to read the second and third paragraphs:

"The various installations of the shanghai prisoner of war camp should be improved as quickly as possible so that there may be no trouble on the occasion of the inspection to be made by the foreigners.

"When you consider the proper time for inspection has been reached, please let me know immediately."

My friend has asked me to read the first paragraph of this document, and I have no objection if the Tribunal has none:

"The inspection of the Hongkong prisoner of war camp by the delegates of the International Red Cross Committee is to be permitted early in May."

The final document in this series is IPS document No. 1552, Item 39. It contains two letters, the first dated 4 April 1942, from Foreign Vice-Finister to

9

6

3

11

10

12 13

14

16 17

18

19 20

> 21 22

23

24

Vice-Minister of War, which contains translation of a letter of 27 March 1942 from Swiss Minister, requesting permission to visit Shanghai prisoner of war camp, and the second, dated 27 April 1942, is a draft reply of Vice-Minister of War to the Foreign Minister. I tender this document in evidence.

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Freeman.

MR. FREEMAN: If the Tribunal please, having presented the P.o.W. phase in the defense case, I object to this document on the grounds of its authenticity and its value.

THE PRESIDENT: There is no certificate before us.

colonel Mornane: If the Tribunal pleases, the certificate covering this document was put in as part of exhibit 3367, I think the number is, and I understand that that certificate is in the Court with that exhibit.

MR. FREEMAN: If the Tribunal please, there is no original of this document in the possession of the Clerk of the Court. It is true there is an affidavit, by a copyer and by Colonel Mornane, stating that he cannot find the original. There is no seal on the document itself that they have offered, which only purports to be a copy of the original. On the face of the English translation it would appear that the document was presented

3 4

5

7 8

9

11

12

13

14

16

18

19

21

22

23

to those bureaus within the War Ministry before dispatching. Nowever, even when the Japanese copy, which is a copy of a copy of the original that is on file with the Clerk is examined, all places for seals are blank.

Further, it is not clear whether this document was drafted by the 13th Army or the War Ministry, if by either. There is not even any name as to the individual who drafted the document.

I am further informed that after the Arbitration Board checked it, there are several deletions and insertions in the English that do not appear in the Japanese copy. On this basis, the authenticity of the document has not been established, and its value, certainly, could be very little, if anything, for the Tribunal.

COLONEL MORNANE: If the Tribunal pleases, as I understand my friend's objection it is really to the document, which was originally part of exhibit 1552. That is a file of documents certified to by an official of the Prisoners of War Information Bureau as forming part of their official file. It is not suggested by the prosecution that it is necessarily anything more than an information copy which had been given to the Information Bureau in the normal course of events.

As the Tribunal will recall, a Japanese order

,

.20

for the destruction of documents, exhibit 2000, will account for the absence of quite a number of original documents.

As a circulative copy, you would not expect it to bear any seals, but the heading of it bears a date purporting to show that it was submitted on 23 April 1942, and that would lead to the conclusion that this, at all events, purports to be a copy of what was an original document. As I understand my friend, he is not making any allegation that the copy which is before the Court is other than a copy of what he calls a copy which was originally in the file, 1552.

I have no knowledge of any decision by the Arbitration Board, but presume that in any event they would report it to the Tribunal.

MR. FREEMAN: If the Tribunal please, I am questioning the correctness of the English translation, even of the copy, and Captain Kraft of the Arbitration Board has seen the translation and the Japanese, and if the Tribunal wishes his report he can make it how.

THE PRESIDENT: Captain Kraft.

23 24

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Greenberg & Yelden

LANGUAGE ARBITER (Captain Kraft): If the Tribunal please, I wish to say on behalf of the Language Board that it objects to being quoted from the lectern here by any other than itself. We wish to make any decisions regarding copies ourselves. In regard to the correctness of the translation as submitted to us, the word "copy" has been left off of the English.

The third line of the English copy, "Decision authorized by: Vice-Minister" gives the wrong impression because in the Japanese it is a form which says "Decision authorized by Vice-Minister," but it doesn't have the Vice-minister's authorization there. It would appear that the authorization has been given there, but it has not. From the English it would appear so.

The fourth line, "Action authorized by:
War Ministry" is also a form which says "Action
authorized by." "War Ministry" does not appear in
the Japanese. That is, it does not appear that it
is authorized by the War Ministry.

Another item that is omitted, "draft copy by."

THE MONITOR: Captain Kraft, could you give us the Japanese for that? For what line in the Eng-

lish?

LANGUAGE ARBITER (Captain Kraft): It isn't in the English.

THE MONITOR: Give us the Japanese word for it.

LANGUAGE ARBITER (Captain Kraft): Let's see, I don't know as I remember the exact Japanese word.

THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Mornane, do you think it is worthwhile wasting all this time of the Tribunal over a document of this type?

COLONEL MORNANE: Oh, no, sir, I do not; and I did not realize, of course, that this would happen. The document only completes the story, and I am quite willing to leave it off rather than waste the time of the Tribunal.

THE PRESIDENT: You withdraw it? COLONEL MORNANE: I withdraw it.

Now, if the Tribunal please, in the course of the ITAGAKI defense phase, three of the Red Cross Reports admitted in evidence (exhibits 3308, 3309, and 3310, at pages 30,174-90) referred to POW Camps in Korea, their general effect being to establish the conditions at those camps were good. In exhibit 3310, which refers to a visit to the First Branch of the War Prisoners Camp in Korea on 30 December 1944,

X

.

the following appears: "We had an interview in the presence of the Commandant of the Internment Camp with major William George Holohan, Captain Mac Gyl Bray and Non-Commissioned Officer belonging to the Headquarters, Gardener. Major Holohan, who is an Englishman, expressed his gratitude to the camp officials. He regretted for his having failed to express his thankfulness the last time when the representative visited." This, although forming part of the exhibit, was not read into the record, but still constitutes part of the evidence.

The previous visit to this camp was on 16 November 1943 (exhibit 3140, at page 27,949.)

evidence to show that on the occasion of the Red Cross Representatives visit on 16 November 1943, the officers and N.C.O. referred to above, actually made complaints to the Red Cross representative and as a result were punished by solitary confinement. Such evidence would raise an inference that the men in question were terrorized into expressing their regret for not having thanked the camp staff on the previous occasion; otherwise, how explain the inconsistency of their conduct? It is significant that the Japanese report of what took place between other

officers and the Red Cross Representative on 16 November 1943, (exhibit 3307), was put in evidence but no report was given as to any interview with the officers previously mentioned. It is also significant that in exhibits 3308 and 3310 a full report is given as to camp conditions whilst exhibit 3309 confines itself to accounts of interviews.

The evidence I tender is an affidavit made for another purpose in Western Australia on the 6th of August, 1947, two months before the Red Cross reports referred to were admitted in evidence.

I tender IPS document No. 3176, the affidavit of Cecil Raymond Farley.

AR. SASAGAWA: If the Tribunal please, SASAGAWA on behalf of the defendant ITAGAKI.

First of all, I object to the introduction of this document as the affiant is not produced for cross-examination. I do not think it is necessary for me to deal with the necessity of production of such witness as the Tribunal has on many occasions asked production of the witness unless upon reasonable grounds. This affidavit is produced for the purpose of rebutting the Red Cross Representative's report on Korean Camp -- POW camps, which report the Tribunal will remember fully set out conditions and treatment

10

11 12

13

14 15

> 16 17

18 19

20 21

22

efforded to POW's there. But, whereas this affidavit is supposed to rebut the detailed good conditions of the POW Camps in hearsay and in very short and vague terms of poor conditions, the Court will see in paragraph five, the latter part, "Apparently in the short space of time while the interview lasted they were able to impress upon the representative the poor condition of the prisoners." That is the only word appearing rebutting the Red Cross report.

Secondly, I object to this document as the second half of the statement is nothing but hearsay of third or fourth degree remote.

Thirdly, I object to the introduction of this affidavit. He states the conditions and treatment in very general terms, and no concrete evidence -- this part I have already said; but no concrete evidence to impeach the report of the Red Cross Representative, which is exhibit 3308.

Another ground of objection is paragraph six with is entirely repetitive as the penalty imposed on some POW's who attempted to escape is made clear by prosecution's exhibit 1998, transcript 14,687.

on these grounds I object to the introduction of this document.

THE PRESIDENT: Do you wish to be heard

3 4

6

5

8

10

12

13 14

> 15 16

> > 17

19

20

22 23

24

further? You have had a lot to say already, Colonel.

COLONEL MORNANE: Yes, with regard to one
matter where I think my friend may have unintentionally misled the Tribunal. He refers to exhibit 3308
which refers to the visit to the prisoner of war
camp in 1942, not to 1943, and there is no detailed
Red Cross report covering the visit of 1943.

MR. SASAGAWA: The Court will -- may I speak?

THE PRESIDENT: What do you want to say?

MR. SASAGAWA: I was going to say that there is a report of 1943 about the visit to the camp in Korea, and there the prisoners clearly stated that conditions are very good and they are very thankful to the camp commandant. And that is 3309, sir.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority, the objections are overruled and the document admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 3176 will receive exhibit No. 3844.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution exhibit No. 3844 and received in evidence.)

THE PRESIDENT: I think we all fear we are spending a lot of time on what may be classed as rag

8 9

ends. We will recess for fifteen minutes. (Whereupon, at 1445, a recess was taken until 1500, after which the proceed-ings were resumed as follows:)

•

Morse & Whale

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

THE PRESIDENT: The Tribunal, by a majority, has decided that it is not necessary to call the witness YOSHIDA for further re-examination. We do not think that the matter is of sufficient importance to warrant that course.

MR. FURNESS: I assume your Honor means for cross-examination.

THE PRESIDENT: That is right. I said that, for further cross-exemination.

Colonel Mornanc.

COLONEL MORNANE: I propose to read paragraph
5 of this exhibit if the Court pleases:

on or about the 15th November 1943 when a representative of the International Red Cross made a visit to Jinsen Camp. We all had some knowledge of the proposed visit from information gained by the prisoners from various sources and also from the hasty efforts of the Japanese to make the Camp look a little more presentable than it usually was. The representative duly arrived -- he was not a Japanese -- and was shown around the camp. The Camp Commandant called up Major Holohan, Captain MacGillivray and Warrant Officer Clapp

(all persons from an English regiment) to interview the Red Cross representative in the Japanese lines. As representatives of the prisoners these officers had a long list of complaints which they intended to place before the Red Cross representative if possible but after being taken to the interview they were prevented by the Japanese in charge from saying anything more than a few words and the interview closed very abruptly as far as they were concerned. Apparently in the short space of time while the interview lasted they were able to impress upon the representative the poor condition of the prisoners. Two days afterwards the three prisoners above were summoned to the Japanese lines to appear before OKAZAKI the Camp Commandant. He charged then with making untrue statements to the Red Cross representative and then sentenced them with terms of solitary confinement as follows:

> Major Holohan 10 days Captain MacGillivray and Warrant Officer 2 days each."

Colonel Woolworth will now follow, if the Tribunal please.

> THE PRESIDENT: Colonel Woolworth. MR. WOOLWORTH: If the Tribunal please: Prosecution offers in rebuttal IPS document

25

1

3

6

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Clapp

3337 which is entitled "Matter relating to the Establishment of an Office Concerning Japanese Residing in Enemy Countries and Enemy Nationals Residing in Japan." The attached certificate of HAYASHI, Kaoru, Chief of /rchives Section of the Foreign Ministry shows this office in the Foreign Hinistry was established through the sanction of 14 November 1942 and began its duties 1 December 1942.

This document implements Article I of the Imperial Ordinance relating to the organization of the Foreign Ministry, exhibit 76. Paragraphs 3 and 4 of the document and paragraph 3 of "Data" accompanying same show the duties and responsibility of this office of the Foreign Ministry concerning Energy Nationals held by Japan as Internees and Prisoners of War.

This regulation contradicts the testimony of TOGO, who stated that no responsibility for the management of prisoners of war accrues to Foreign Ministry and that it was only a channel of communication, transcript pages 35,768 to 9 and 35,771.

It further contradicts the testimony of SUZUKI, Tadakatsu elicited on cross-examination by counselfor SHIGEMITSU, Mamoru, in which he stated there was no authority in the Foreign Office in connection

7 8

with prisoners of wer, aside from conducting correspondence, transcript 15,530.

THE PRESIDENT: Major Furness.

MR. FURNISS: If the Court please, the defense objects to the admission of this document and of the certificates attached thereto. It is on its face a draft. I call attention to the first word of the title which I believe was omitted in referring to the document by the learned prosecutor.

THE PRESIDENT: It also states it was approved on November 14, 1942.

MR. FURNESS: It does not. It has on its face "draft," and the "approved" applies to the draft.

THE PRESIDENT: It also has that on its face on the same sheet that it has "draft," approved on that date and the certificate bears that out.

MR. FURNESS: If your Honor will allow me

THE PRISIDENT: We are wasting a lot of time on very small objections which cannot succeed eventually.

MR. FURNESS: It appears it was only approved and drafted by the Chief of the Second Section of the Treatics Bureua. The certificate which is attached I assume is a substitute for the certificate which was originally attached. It says merely it was approved by

2

5

8

9

10

12

13

15

16

18

19

21

22

24

higher office. It does not appear at all what that higher office was. It does not appear that any sanction was given. The certificate which says it began its duties is not a certificate as to document; it is a certificate as to fact and is not proper in this form in any way.

MAYASHI was not Chief of the Archives Section on 14 November 1942 as appears from his testimony on record 22,780. This is in no sense a regulation as referred to by the prosecutor. It is merely a draft and does not set up what the functions of this bureau eventually were. I submit it cannot be accepted as proof to rebut any testimony of SUZUKI who was called as a witness by the prosecution, who was not asked any questions on redirect and whose testimony was characterized by the President of the Tribunal as most important. He, himself, testified that the bureau -- the name of his bureau was Bureau in Charge of Japanese Nationals in Enemy Countries. That testimony was not on cross-examination but on direct examination, reference record 12,830.

The third page indicates that on November 14, the date to which the learned prosecutor has referred, it had never been referred to the cabinet at all and I submit that it is in no way admissible, that it

3 4

7 8

:20

has no probative value, and, since it has no probative value, is not important.

I refer to the date on page 3, November 19, 1942, which is subsequent to the date on page 1, April 14, which says "approved" -- November 14. I submit that it cannot be alleged on that that it was approved by any higher authority than the Chief of the Second Section of the Treaties Bureau on November 14, 1942.

MR. WOOLWORTH: If the Tribunal please, there is no allegation that this regulation was approved by the Cabinet. I think it was distinctly stated by the witness SUZUKI, Tadakatsu, that he was in charge of the office concerning Japanese residing in enemy countries and enemy nationals residing in Japan. Furthermore, he testified that he functioned as chief of such bureau and it had been a bureau not before in existence.

Furthermore, the approval of this regulation was not essential by the Cabinet. It is a metter within the jurisdiction of the Foreign Office, a matter which had formerly been handled by the Treaties Bureau as appears from the evidence in the case.

MR. FURNESS: I must, if your Honor please, correct one misstatement of the record by the prosecutor. I refer to page 12,830 in which SUZUKI testified that, I quote "The correct name of the bureau over which I presided was the 'Bureau in Charge of Japanese Nationals in Enemy Countries.'" And I wish to state definitely that that is the only testimony that he gave regarding the name of his bureau, and I have checked the record.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is overruled and the document admitted on the usual terms.

3 4

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 3337 will receive exhibit No. 3845.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution exhibit No. 3845 and received in evidence.)

THE PRESIDENT: You are not going to read it all, are you, Colonel?

MR. WOOLWORTH: "Drafted: November 12, 1942
Approved: November 14, 1942 Section 2 of the Treaties
Bureau."

I will read the first paragraph and part of section 1 and part of the data.

"In the present Greater East Asia War, the Foreign Ministry finds it necessary to ensure the protection of Japanese interned in enemy countries and also make the world aware of Japan's moral principles by treating the enemy nationals under our jurisdiction and control in a fair and just manner. Since the treatment of Japanese nationals interned in enemy countries and the treatment accorded enemy nationals under our jurisdiction have an inseparable and close relationship, it is necessary that matters relating to the above, which are now being dealt with by various bureaus and sections, be unified and dealt with in a comprehensive manner. Therefore, it is requested that

a new office be established under the direct jurisdicthon of the Vice Minister, and composed mainly of repatriated diplomats; and have this office deal with the aforementioned matter.

"We hereby request your approval.

"I. Work to be handled by the new office.

(Full liaison shall be maintained with bureaus and sections concerned.)"

I turn to sub-paragraph 3 of section 1 on page .

"(3) Matters relating to enemy nationals who are internees, prisoners of war, or interned in concentration camps under Japanese jurisdiction.

"Looks after business related to the treatment (clothes, food, living quarters, inquiries and answers as to safety, communication of the 'list' (T.N. of their names), appointment of, and calls on, the nation representing their interests and the delegation of the International Committee of Red Cross, communications, relief, labor, punishment, repatriation, etc.) of the above-mentioned enemy nationals. Among the above-mentioned business shall be included, replying to proposals from enemy countries and other sources.

"(4) In dealing with the above-mentioned business, shall handle negotiations with and guidance

3 4

1

5

8

7

9

11

12

14

15 16

17

19

20 21

22

23 24

to the interest-protecting power, International Committee of the Red Cross or Vatican, and to give guidance to relief bodies at home and abroad."

I turn now to page 3.

"Data for Explaining at Cabinet Meeting re Interned and Prisoner of War Duties (November 19, 1942 'JO'-2)

"The Foreign Ministry has, with Minister SUZUKI who returned recently to Japan from Egypt and who has been ordered to engage temporarily in Foreign Ministry duties - as their chief, arranged to have several diplomats and consulate members, who have returned to Japan from enemy countries, engage in the following duties, maintaining liaison with the Bureaus and Sections concerned:

"1) Duties regarding investigations and improvement of the conditions of Japanese held as internees, concentration camp internees or prisoners of war in enemy countries."

I turn to paragraph 3.

"3) Business relative to the prisoners of war, internees or enemy countries' nationals who are now in concentration camps as internees within the influence of Japan.

"Business will be handled pertaining to the

3

5

* 8

9

11

13

14

16

17 18

19

21

23 24

to the interest-protecting power, International Committee of the Red Cross or Vatican, and to give guidance to relief bodies at home and abroad."

I turn now to page 3.

"Data for Explaining at Cabinet Meeting re Interned and Prisoner of War Duties (November 19, 1942 'JO'-2)

"The Foreign Ministry has, with Minister SUZUKI who returned recently to Japan from Egypt and who has been ordered to engage temporarily in Foreign Ministry duties - as their chief, arranged to have several diplomats and consulate members, who have returned to Japan from enemy countries, engage in the following duties, maintaining liaison with the Bureaus and Sections concerned:

"1) Duties regarding investigations and improvement of the conditions of Japanese held as internees, concentration camp internees or prisoners of war in enemy countries."

I turn to paragraph 3.

"3) Business relative to the prisoners of war, internees or enemy countries' nationals who are now in concentration camps as internees within the influence of Japan.

"Business will be handled pertaining to the

2

5

. 8

9

11

12 13

14

16

18

17

19

21 22 23

treatment of enemy nationals, the visit by the representatives of the interest-protecting powers or by the members of the Red Cross Society's International Committee, shipments from enemy countries of relief supplies and remittance of money, inquiry and information as to the status of the persons affected.

"The above business includes such jobs as dealing with protests or any other representations that may be submitted by enemy countries and others."

ment No. 3356, which is excerpt from the interrogation of HASHIMOTO, Kingoro, of 17 January 1946, which contradicts the testimeny of defendant HASHIMOTO as to the shelling of the British ship "Ladybird," appearing at transcript page 28,796, wherein he stated the shelling of the "Ladybird" was by mistake and the testimony of defense witness OBATA, Minoru, appearing in transcript at pages 28,769-70, wherein he quoted a different order from Lieutenant General YANAGAWA, and stated the shelling started before dawn.

MR. HAYASHI: HAYASHI, representing the accused HASHIMOTO.

I object to this document. The contents of this document are practically similar to those put in in court exhibit 258, transcript page 3,466. It

3 4 5

contains no facts which may rebut the numerous evidence which has been produced in this Court heretofore. It is unnecessarily repetitive, and I object to its presentation.

MR. WOOLWORTH: If the Tribunal please, I admit that parts of this document are repetitive, but in order to complete the continuity I had reproduced the whole of his answer instead of just part of it which bore the number exhibit 258. The part which was omitted in 258 contradicts the testimony of the witness OBATA in important details and contradicts the testimony of HASHIMOTO on his direct examination.

Duda & Sriratt

THE PRESIDENT: What does it contain that is new and important?

MR. WOOLWORTH: It contains answers to interrogatories given by HASHIMOTO under oath on the 17th of January, 1946, which contradicts his own statement on direct examination that the shelling was by mistake.

THE PRESIDENT: Did you tender his interrogetion in chief? How did you come to omit that?

MR. WOOLWORTH: I was cutting down on the amount of testimony which was introduced in order to save time, and I thought that could well be left out. I didn't expect contradiction.

THE PRESIDENT: It may be this is already in evidence. It appears in a summary of the evidence made for the Judges by some of the staff, and they do not take anything outside of the evidence.

evidence, if your Honor please, is the answer down to the word "nationality" in the 5th line. I am perfectly willing to omit that in the reading of the document.

THE PRESIDENT: That part is in the summary, certainly, but as to the balance I am not so sure.

On a perusal of IPS document 3356, which is

1 2

now being presented to the Court, I find the following words. It says: ". . . it turned out to be the British gun-boat, 'Ladybird.'" This shows that the bombardment of the vessel was a mistake. Moreover, that the bombing of Ladybird, that the shelling of Ladybird was due to heavy fog is made clear in the various documents exchanged between the Japanese and British governments, which were made exhibits in this Tribunal. Therefore, I find that the presentation of this document is unnecessarily repetitious.

THE PRESIDET: No, he says the fog lifted, according to this, before he fired. That is the point.

MR. HAYASHI: Where it says the fog lifted means that because the fog had lifted slightly he was barely able to see the surface of the river, and therefore when the Ladybird approached his vision he found that it was an English boat.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection . is overruled and the document admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 3356 will receive exhibit No. 3846.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution exhibit

10

11 12

13

14 15

16 17

18 19

20

21 22

23 24

No. 3846 and received in evidence.)

MR. WOOLWORTH: (Reading)

"Excerpt from Interrogation of HASHIMOTO, Kingoro, 17 January 1946.

"Q Under whose orders did you act when you shelled the Ladybird?"

Omitting the first sentence:

"A . . . I believe these orders were issued two days before the fall of Nanking. I believe that was about the 10th of December 1937. Those orders were received about 0200 when I was about 5 or 6 kilos downstream from Wuhu. Having received the orders I returned to Wuhu and prepared my guns. The next morning the river was heavily fog bound and when the fog lifted at about 1000 I noticed four ships were in the stream, three of which were gray and one ship was painted white. I immediately started shelling them and the three gray ships fled downstream. The white ship came towards our position and it turned out to be the British gun-boat, 'Ladybird.' The other three were Chinese ships which had been landing troops on the shore."

I will omit the last sentence.

That completes the rebuttal. Mr. Oneto will address the Court.

3

1

5

.7

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

17

18

20

22

24

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Oneto.

MR. ONETO: May it please the Court, reference is made now to order of list No. 11-A.

I offer in evidence IPS document No. 3360.

This is a telegram dated 8 August 1940, sent from Wiesbaden, seat of the Armistice Commission, by Hencke to the German Foreign Ministry. It refers to a communication from the French General Huntziger to General Stuelpnagel.

This document is offered to rebut the statement of the accused TOJO, relating to the stationing of troops in North French Indo-China, that the two aspects of the southern policy, determined on 27 July 1940, "were intended to be attained through peaceful means until pressure from America, Britain and the Netherlands, against Japan, resulted in unforeseen practical developments." Transcript 36,197 to 36,198.

MR. BLEWETT: If the Tribunal please, this document purports to be a diplomatic German opinion before the negotiations were concluded, and we submit that the evidence is irrelevant and immaterial, in view of the fact that the executed MATSUOKA-Henry Agreement of 30 August 1940 is in evidence as exhibit 618-A, particularly the attached document 10-1 and 10-2,

7 8

THE PRESIDENT: Mr. Oneto.

MR. ONETO: May it please the Court, reference is made now to order of list No. 11-A.

I offer in evidence IPS document No. 3360.

This is a telegram dated 8 August 1940, sent from Wiesbaden, seat of the Armistice Commission, by Hencke to the German Foreign Ministry. It refers to a communication from the French General Huntziger to General Stuelpnagel.

This document is offered to rebut the statement of the accused TOJO, relating to the stationing of troops in North French Indo-China, that the two aspects of the southern policy, determined on 27 July 1940, "were intended to be attained through peaceful means until pressure from America, Britain and the Netherlands, against Japan, resulted in unforeseen practical developments." Transcript 36,197 to 36,198.

MR. BLEWETT: If the Tribunal please, this document purports to be a diplomatic German opinion before the negotiations were concluded, and we submit that the evidence is irrelevant and immaterial, in view of the fact that the executed MATSUOKA-Henry Agreement of 30 August 1940 is in evidence as exhibit 618-A, particularly the attached document 10-1 and 10-2,

7 8

as well as all preliminary negotiations pertaining thereto.

We also submit, if your Honors please, that this document adds nothing new or important to the case, and it simply reopens the general phase.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is overruled and the document admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 3360 will receive exhibit No. 3847.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution exhibit No. 3847 and received in evidence.)

MR. ONETO: I now read exhibit No. 3847.

"Telegram. Open. wie Sbaden, 8 August 1940,
1730. Arrival: 8 August 1940, 1745. No. 114, Secret.

"With reference to today's long-distance
telephone conversation with Legation Secretary Grote
Cipher.

"1. /I/ reproduce below the strictly confidential wording of the report of General Von
Stuelpnagel to the OKW /Oberkommando der Wehrmacht
'High Command of the Armed Forces'/ on his conversation with General Huntziger concerning the Japanese demand of right of way through Indo-China:

General Huntziger made the following oral report to General Von Stuelpnagel on his /General Huntziger's/ return from Vichy on the evening of August 7:

"On 1 or 2 August the Japanese Government dispatched a note to the Governor-General of French Indo-China in which it was demanded that the French Government should grant the Japanese in Tongking all the requisit facilities for their waging of war against China. In the first place /TN: all underlining in pencil in the original photostat/ the Japanese wished to have the Haiphong-Yunnan Railway placed at their disposal for troop transport to Southwest China in

order to be able to carry out the shutting off of
Chungking from the southwest. The Japanese demand was
in <u>ultimative</u> form, but without a time limit. In <u>case</u>
of rejection Japan reserved for herself further measures.

"The French Government on 3 August ordered the Governor-General in Indo-China to reply to the Japanese that the Japanese demand meant a violation of French sovereignty. The French Government had given no grounds for this, since it had already stopped the arms traffic through Tongking to China some eight or nine months earlier. The French Government could therefore in no case meet the Japanese demand in this form. Eventual concessions could only be made on the basis of free agreement with Japan. The sovereignty of the French colonial empire must, however, in no manner be infringed thereby.

"General Huntziger stated that the French
Government had informed the U.S.A. of these events.

He had the further request to make that the German
Government communicate the French point of view to the

Japanese Embassy, since neither the French Government

nor the Japanese Embassy in Vichy had an unobjectionable
connection to Tokyo. The French Government was of the

opinion that on the basis of the armistice agreement
the German Government must have an interest in having

no new warlike complications develop in the French colonial empire. They would, however, be unavoidable in case of a Japanese move by force against French Tongking. General Huntziger remarked in this connection that it must surely be in general European interest to prevent a further push-back of the influence of the white race in East Asia.

"No position was taken by General Von Stuelpnagel vis-a-vis these statements. It was promised, however, to transmit them to the German Government. /TN: There is an illegible initial in the upper right-hand corner of the first page. The frame numbers are 147568 and 147569. At the bottom of page 1 appears the filing notation Fr (V). The following distribution appears in the lower left-hand corner of the first page.

"Hencke."

I will now offer in evidence three documents.

They will be tendered separately, but I shall give
the explanation concerning all of them together.

These three documents are offered to contradict the declarations of the accused TOJO, I quote:

"It is true that Japan requested the good offices of the German Government in the negotiations with the French Government but the German Foreign

3 4 5

2

6

8

9

11

13

14 15

16

17

18

20

21 22

23

Minister refused that request. Hence the charges made in the Indictment that pressure was brought to bear on the French through the use of the Germans are not supported by the facts." Transcript page 36252.

I tender IPS document No. 3364. It is a German telegram sent on 23 February 1941 by Rintelen, member of the Secretariat of Foreign Minister von Ribbentrop, transcript page 34,071, to the German representative in Paris. It sets forth the use made by Japan of Germany in the conflict between Thailand and French Indo-China.

MR. BLEWETT: If the Tribunal please, we submit that the associate French prosecutor put all this evidence in the record heretofore in the general phase, and in addition to exhibit 618-A, this whole proceeding in so far as this mediation is concerned is covered in exhibits 633 and 637. We submit that this evidence adds nothing new to the case whatsoever.

THE PRESIDENT: Have you anything to add?

MR. ONETO: No, sir.

THE PRESILENT: Mr. Blewett alleged it is already in evidence. Lo you deny it?

MR. ONETO: It is true that a certain number of accuments have been tendered to this effect. But the accused TOJO formerly contradicted the assertion

7 8

that the German Government had been used by the Japanese Government to exert pressure on the French Government in the conflict between Thailand and French Indo-China. Further, no document tendered up to now is as categorical as the first one which I am now tendering.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is overruled and the document admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 3364 will receive exhibit No. 3848.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution exhibit No. 3848 and received in evidence.)

MR. ONETO: I now read IPS document No. 3364, exhibit No. 3848:

"Telegram (open). Special Train Heinrich, 23 February 1941, 1915 hours. Arrival: 23 February 1941, 1935 hours. 89 No. 23/2. Most Urgent!

"Note: Relayed to Paris Embassy with No. 626, 23 February '41, 1955 hours.

"The German Foreign Minister requests you to get in touch with Ambassador de Brinon or Darlan and to transmit the following communication to him.

The Japanese Government has communicated to the German

3

, 1

6

7 8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

23

24

Government its offer of mediation in the territorial conflict between Thailand and Indo-China with the request to use its influence with the French Government for the acceptance of this offer. The German Government points out the dangers which threaten France in the event of the non-renewal of the armistice expiring 25 February. It considers it as being in the French interest, therefore, to accept the offer of mediation.

"The German Foreign Minister requests you to get in touch with him by telephone again directly upon receipt of this teletype but before carrying out delivery of the communication to de Brinon.

"Fusch1, 23 February 1941.

"Rintelen."

I offer in evidence IPS document No. 3363.

It is a telegram dated 1 March 1941, sent by Schleier to the German Foreign Minister. For the benefit of the Court, I will add that Schleier was stationed in Paris as Charge d'Affaires with the rank of Minister.

This is at transcript page 34,072.

This telegram is the sequel to the intervention of Germany, as was set forth by the last telegram, document 3364, exhibit 3848, previously tendered in evidence. It shows the influence of the Government

3 4 5

of the Reich in this matter.

It appears in the document itself that this communication was submitted to the German Foreign Minister Ribbentrop by a member of his bureau, Dr. Schwarzmann.

I must add that I will only read a part of this document. The second page will be mestly left unread.

MR. CUNNINGHAM: May it please the Tribunal,
I object to this document. It does not direct itself
to any particular defendant's case. It is only a
general issue matter, and it does not rebut any evidence and does not throw any light on any of the issues;
and it is contradictory to the next document that is
coming up and certainly has no probative value.

THE PRESIDENT: By a majority the objection is overruled, and the document admitted on the usual terms.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 3363 will receive exhibit No. 3849.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution exhibit No. 3849 and received in evidence.)

THE PRESIDENT: How much are you going to read? A couple of lines? Are you going to read

much?

MR. ONETO: I intend to read the first page of this document.

THE PRESIDENT: We will adjourn until halfpast nine on Monday morning.

(Whereupon, at 1600, an adjournment was taken until Monday, 26 January 1948, at 0930.)